

REMARKS

At the outset, Applicant thanks the Examiner for examining the pending application. The Office Action dated March 10, 2009 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1 and 13 have been amended to define the invention. No new matter has been added. Thus, claims 1-17 are currently pending. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, and 13 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (US 6,097,362) (hereinafter “Kim”) in view of Lee (US 7,095,393) (hereinafter “Lee”), and rejects claims 4, 7-9, 11, 14, and 16 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over “Kim” and “Lee” as applied to claim 3, and further in view of Jeong (US 6,335,721) (hereinafter “Jeong”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the cited references in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “...a shift register array for sequentially generating a sampling signal; a data register for providing pixel data to a latch array through each of transmittance lines; wherein the latch array for sequentially latches the pixel data by designated units in response to the sampling signal to simultaneously output the latched pixel data to a first multiplexer array, the pixel data including even pixel data (RGB even) and odd pixel data (RGB odd); the first multiplexer array for performing time-division on inputted pixel data to supply time-divided pixel data signals, wherein the first multiplexer array performs at least one time-division each horizontal period; a digital-to-analog converter array for converting the time-divided pixel data signals into pixel voltage signals;...(Emphasis Added)”. None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least these features of claim 1.

First of all, none of the cited references teaches “the first multiplexer array for performing time-division on inputted pixel data to supply time-divided pixel data signals, wherein the first multiplexer array performs at least one time-division each horizontal period” of claim 1. Further, on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner noted that items D1-D2 of fig. 7 of “Lee” are corresponding to odd and even data. However, Applicant respectfully disagrees. See lines 1-31, col. 12 and Fig. 7 of “Lee”. In particular, lines 9-10, col. 12 of “Lee” merely shows “a plurality of data lines D1, D2,..., Dn” which never mean even pixel data and odd pixel data. Thus, the cited references including “Lee” fail to teach “the first multiplexer array for

performing time-division on inputted pixel data to supply time-divided pixel data signals, wherein the first multiplexer array performs at least one time-division each horizontal period;". For at least this reason, Applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable over the cited references and claims 2-12, which variously depend from claim 1, are also allowable over the cited references at least for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 13, as amended, is allowable over the cited references in that claim 13 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "...supplying pixel data from an external source; performing time-division on the pixel data inputted from the external source to output time-divided pixel data, wherein the step of performing time-division includes performing at least one time-division each horizontal period; converting the time-divided pixel data into pixel voltage signals; and performing time-division on data lines to supply the converted pixel voltage signals thereto,". None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least these features of claim 13. Applicant's arguments above with respect to claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 13. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 13 is allowable over the cited references and claims 14-17, which depend on variously claim 13, are also allowable over the cited references at least for the same reasons as claim 13.

The Examiner states that claims 5-6, 10, 12, 15 and 17 are allowed. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in this application.

Applicant believes the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Application No.: 10/717,675
Amdt. dated June 10, 2009
Reply to Office Action dated March 10, 2009

Docket No.: 8734.259 US

Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: June 10, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes
Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No.: 53,005
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant